DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 036 593 UD 009 611

AUTHOR	NECKRITZ, BENJAMIN; FORLANO, GEORGE
TITLE	PROGRAM TO EXCITE POTENTIAL (P.E.P), WINTER PROGRAM 1968-1969.
INSTITUTION	NEW YORK CITY BOARD OF EDUCATION, BROOKLYN, N.Y. BUREAU OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH.
SPONS AGENCY	NEW YORK STATE EDUCATION DEPT., ALBANY.
PUB DATE	SEP 69
NOTE	33P.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC NOT AVAILABLE FROM EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	ACHIEVEMENT RATING, ASPIRATION, *DISADVANTAGED YOUTH, EDUCATIONAL IMPROVEMENT, HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS, *MUSIC EDUCATION, SELF CONCEPT, *STUDENT ATTITUDES, TALENTED STUDENTS, *UNDERACHIEVERS, URBAN YOUTH
IDENTIFIERS	NEW YORK CITY, PEP, *PROGRAM TO EXCITE POTENTIAL

ABSTRACT

THE 1968-69 WINTER SESSION OF THE PROGRAM TO EXCITE POTENTIAL (PEP), FUNDED BY THE NEW YORK STATE URBAN EDUCATION PROGRAM, INCLUDED 45 NINTH AND TENTH GRADE NEW YORK CITY STUDENTS WHO WERE IDENTIFIED AS UNDERACHIEVING, DISADVANTAGED, AND HAVING SUFFICIENT TALENT TO WARRANT FURTHER MUSICAL INSTRUCTION. THE PROGRAM, HOUSED AT THE RIVERDALE SCHOOL OF MUSIC IN THE BRONX, WAS DESIGNED AS A SECOND FOLLOW-THROUGH OF A MORE EXTENSIVE PEP THAT HAD BEEN HELD THE PREVIOUS SUMMER. SUMMARIES OF STUDENT SELF-RATINGS INDICATED IMPROVEMENTS IN ACADEMIC ATTITUDES AND ASPIRATIONS IN ADDITION TO THE ATTAINMENT OF MUSICAL ABILITIES AND APPRECIATIONS.
NOT AVAILABLE IN HARD COPY DUE TO MARGINAL LEGIBILITY OF ORIGINAL DOCUMENT. (KG)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

09611 E

ED036593

UD 009 611

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
Nathan Brown, Acting Superintendent of Schools

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH
J. Wayne Wrightstone, Assistant Superintendent

PROGRAM TO EXCITE POTENTIAL (P.E.P.)
Winter Program 1968-1969

Urban Education Grant
New York State Education Department

Prepared by

Benjamin Neckritz and George Forlano

An evaluation of a New York City school district educational project funded by the "New York State Urban Education Program" enacted at the 1968 legislative session of the New York State Legislature for the purpose of "meeting special educational needs associated with poverty" (Chapter 685, Section 9, subdivision 12, laws of 1968).

BUREAU OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH
Samuel D. McClelland, Acting Director
George Forlano, Assistant Administrative Director

September, 1969

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
Implementation of Program	4
Reactions of Director	5
Reactions of Instructors	6
Reactions of the Students	14
Summary and Conclusions	20
Recommendations and Suggestions	23

APPENDIX

Questionnaire for Project Directors	Appendix A
Teacher Questionnaire	Appendix B
Individual Student Evaluation Form	Appendix C
Student Questionnaire	Appendix D

I. INTRODUCTION

The 1968-1969 Winter Program to Excite Potential (PEP) was designed to provide a continuation of experiences and motivation for certain participants in the summer P.E.P. program. Selected participants in the Winter Program were those who were expected to gain optimally from this experience.

The summer P.E.P. program which was characterized as one of the most outstanding of its type, was designed for a group of disadvantaged, underachieving students on a state-wide basis. Participants were selected from several cities and the project was held on the campus of Skidmore College.

The winter program was much more limited both in size and scope. The original target population of 45 students had decreased to 32 student participants in the program. Selection was made from the group of approximately 200 participants in the summer program. The winter program was conducted on a part-time basis. Students selected were all New York City residents attending either public or parochial schools. The program utilized the physical facilities of the Riverdale school of Music which is located in a sylvan setting of the Riverdale section of the Bronx, New York City. The director of the program and certain of the instructors were staff members of the school. The director of the school functioned as an unpaid consultant.

The program's objectives outlined the following priorities:

1. To provide continued music instruction to participants in summer project P.E.P. who have been identified as possessing musical talent and otherwise would be unable to continue with musical instruction.
2. To heighten the motivation and stimulate the talents of P.E.P. students.
3. To increase musical ability through individual instrumental instruction and classes in music theory.
4. To provide cultural enrichment in the area of music.

Description of the Program

A group of 45 ninth and tenth year New York City students was identified by the P.E.P. summer staff as disadvantaged, underachieving and having sufficient talent to warrant additional instrumental instruction. Included in the program were the following features. Each student was to receive twenty-five, individual, 45 minute lessons on a musical instrument. Three classes, not exceeding ten students per class, were to be provided in music theory for twenty-five sessions. A series of lecture-recitals were to be provided featuring professional musicians. Trips to musical events at the Lincoln Center were to be made with admission provided at special reduced rates.

Objectives and Procedures

Objectives:

1. To determine to what extent the program functioned according to original specifications of the proposal.
2. To determine to what degree the program affected students' achievements and behavior.
3. To determine the effectiveness of the supporting services, facilities and materials.

Procedures

1. Questionnaires and rating scales were administered to the Project Director, teachers and participating students. Personal interviews and observations in addition to school records were used to gather data for this survey by the investigator.

2. Inasmuch as the population of the winter program may be characterized numerically as a statistical small sample, the entire group was used.

3. Statistical summaries, analyses and comparisons were made of mean ratings. In addition, chi-square test comparisons were made between teacher ratings of students relative frequency distributions obtained at the end of the summer program, 1968, and those obtained at the end of winter program, 1969. It was planned that the end of summer ratings would serve as pretest entries and the end of the winter program's ratings would serve as posttest data. Comparisons were made of the rating distributions of the entire summer 1968 group with the winter 1969 group which was an integral part of the former. A more direct comparison on a matched basis would have been preferable but was not implemented due to difficulty of access to prior raw data.

Instruments

The following instruments were used to gather data for this survey.

1. Questionnaire for Project Director. [1]
2. Teacher's Questionnaire [2]
3. Individual Student Evaluation Form [3]
4. Student Questionnaire [4]

---

1. See Appendix A
2. See Appendix B
3. See Appendix C
4. See Appendix D

II Implementation of Program and Reactions of Program Director

Responses of the Project Director to the Questionnaire for Project Director indicated that the program was implemented by ten teachers of music, plus a part-time secretary and a non-paid consultant. The latter position was filled by the Director of the Riverdale School of Music. Although originally projected for 45 students, 32 registered for the program.

The principal reason ascribed for students' dropping out of the program was listed under a broad heading "family reasons". Additional questioning showed this item to include diverse household chores such as "baby sit ing" with a younger member of the family, to holding a part-time job.

Attendance and student organization was analyzed by the director in Table 1A that follows. This shows the program organized into three groups. Two beginner groups showing an overall weighted average of 75% attendance and an advanced group showing a 90% attendance. Table 1B shows individual attendance per cent and course of instruction. The overall average attendance computed from data of table 1B was 81%. Eleven students or 34% of the students, registered for instruction in two instruments. The remainder, 21 students or 66%, registered for instruction in one instrument.

Table 1 A

Unit Organization and Per Cent Attendance

Unit	No. of Students	Per Cent Attendance
Unit I (Beginners)	11	78%
Unit II (Beginners)	8	70%
Unit III (Advanced)	7	90%

Table 1 B

Individual Student Organization and Per Cent Attendance

Student	Instrument(s) Instruction	Per Cent Attendance
a	Bass, Piano	*
b	Bass	*
c	Cello	89
d	Cello	78
e	Cello	*
f	Clarinet	78
g	Clarinet, flute	39
h	Clarinet, flute	100
i	Clarinet, piano	95
j	Clarinet, piano	50
k	Flute	78
l	Flute	83
m	Guitar	67
n	Piano	100
O	Piano	*
p	Piano, flute	100
q	Piano, flute	*
r	Saxophone	89
s	Saxophone, piano	83
t	Trumpet	78
u	Tuba	*
v	Tuba	95
w	Trumpet	72
x	Viola	63
y	Viola	78
z	Violin	78
aa	Violin	89
ab	Violin	95
ac	Violin	67
ad	Violin, piano	95
ae	Violin, piano	100
af	Violin, piano	72
Total 32		81.1

* Withdrawn

Reactions of the Director of the Program

The response to the question "In terms of anticipated enrollment, facilities made available, supplies received, participation of personnel etc., to what extent would you say the program has been implemented?" was "100 per cent."

The program was rated "5, highly successful" on a five point rating scale relating to anticipated actual outcomes of the program.

The director asserted the belief that the program should operate again during the next school year stating that, "Students whose interest in music has been aroused cannot be left (fallow) after only a summer course. They must continue during the winter."

The response "all aspects of the program should continue" was made to the item, "If the program should operate next year, a) What aspects of the program should be continued?" b)"What aspects of the program should be discontinued?" had a negative response.

It was indicated in the response to an item requesting additional suggestions that all the past year's suggestions were incorporated into the program. An area of additional improvement suggested was that of the administrative procedures of the Office of Business Affairs of the New York City Board of Education. Payments to the instructors were described as "very slow."

III. Reactions of the Instructors

Responses to the Teacher's Questionnaires[2] confirmed that instruction was given in the previously tabulated areas of cello, clarinet, flute, trumpet, tuba, violin, string bass, piano and theory.

Nine of the ten instructors responded to the questionnaire. Eight of the nine indicated that their educational background included completion of the master's degree. The ninth indicated the equivalent, with two years of graduate work completed. One of the instructors held a New Jersey teacher's license, one held a New York City license in English.

---

[2] See Appendix B

Item seven requested the instructors to briefly describe the salient features of his program. A typical response may be quoted, "Improvement of overall ability on instrument with concentration on ensemble playing and performance. Development of regular and good practice techniques. Improvement of students' interest in music in general."

Table 2 that follows lists the responses to the five-point scaled question, "To what extent do you feel you have accomplished the goals of your program as set up?" Three of the nine respondents or 33% rated their accomplishment at "(3) some," three rated themselves at (3.5) between some and much, which was the average since the three remaining rated their program accomplishment at "(4) much". Data relating to motivation was also analyzed. Eight responses and one non-response to the 5 point scaled question, "How would you characterize the motivational impact of the program on most of the students?" were tabulated. The summary shows two respondents or 25% rated students at "(5) strongly self-motivated," five respondents or 62.5%, the modal response, rated their students at "(4), somewhat self-motivated," five respondents or 62.5%, the modal response, rated their students at "(4), somewhat self-motivated," One instructor rated his students at "(2) needed some reinforcement." Included in the table is the student load per instructor which showed an average of 7 students. Certain students were instructed on more than one instrument.

---

2 See Appendix B

Table 2

Instructor Ratings for 26 Participating Students in each of Instrumental Areas

Instructor and Instrument(s)	No. of Students	Rating of Accomplishment	Motivational Impact
a. Clarinet, flute	3	4	4
b. Flute	3	4	5
c. Cello, bass	5	3	4
d. Piano	11	3.5	5
e. Clarinet and theory	10	3	2
f. Violin	10	3.5	4
g. Trumpet, tuba	4	3	4
h. Flute	--*	4	--*
i. Piano	10	3.5	4
Means for Total Group		3.5	4.0

* No Response

The music teachers were also requested to rate their students on the individual Student Evaluation Form.[3] This form provided a five-point scaled rating on 12 factors, seven of which were specifically addressed to musical ability. Independent ratings were requested on both their present ability level and the amount of improvement achieved. Similar group records of ratings were obtained from summaries of student ratings at the end of the previous summer program.[5] Group ratings were compared for each factor, except the last item "motivation", which was not included in the rating of the previous summers' program. In principle, it was hoped that the final summer ratings would serve as pretest entries and the winter program's ratings

---

[3] See Appendix C

[5] "Evaluation Report for Program to Excite Potential 1967-1968" ESEA Title III Psychological Corporation, P.28, January 1969

would serve as the post-test group.

These results are summarized and analyzed in Table 3A "Level of Ability" and Table 3B "Amount of Improvement Shown" that follow, for both the Summer 1968 and Winter 1969 groups. As mentioned, approximately 200 students were rated at the conclusion of the previous summer's program. The distribution of these ratings were compared with those received by the 21 students rated toward the end of the Winter program. As the participants in the winter group were selected from the population of the summer group a chi square test was made of each of the common factors rated, comparing the relative distribution for each. P values or the probability of obtaining by chance a distribution that fit equal to or worse than that obtained was also indicated. Ratings for the winter program were adjusted for non-responses. Siegel [6] cites, the chi square approximation may be applied with little risk to small samples when N's are unequal. In Table 3A it is observed that eight of the eleven factors compared, refuted the null hypothesis that there were no differences in the ratings distribution other than a chance occurrence. This finding was not proportionately confirmed from the dimension "amount of improvement" in Table 3B. In this instance, four of the eleven factors compared, indicated that the observed differences may be due to sources other than chance. Restated, differences in the frequency distributions of seven of the eleven factors may be attributed to chance. Again it may be noted that factor L, "motivation," was not compared as it had no antecedent in the previous summer's rating sheet.

Means for each factor were computed and compared. In Table 3A, "level of ability" nine of the eleven factors compared showed decreases

---

6 Seigel, S. "Non-Parametric Statistics for Behavioral Sciences"p.135. McGraw-Hill, N.Y., 1956.

in the means. This finding was reversed in Table 3B, "amount of improvement". Compared means for eleven factors indicate eight showed an increase in the amount of improvement acquired as compared to that at the end of the summer program. The motivational factor means were 3.40 and 2.84 for level of ability and amount of improvement respectively.

Table 3A

Music Teachers' Ratings of Students at End of Programs as to Level of Ability

PERCENTAGE FREQUENCIES AND MEAN RATINGS

FACTOR	RATINGS					
	LITTLE OR NONE 1	2	3	4	A GREAT DEAL 5	MEAN RATING
A. General Musicianship						
No. Summer 158	17.7	13.3	34.2	25.3	9.5	2.96
No. Winter 21	0	14.3	19.0	38.1	28.6	3.81
		X^2 = 14.6			P = .01	
B. Group Performance						
No. Summer 144	20.8	13.9	31.2	25.0	9.0	2.87
No. Winter 13	0	23.1	23.1	15.4	38.5	3.70
		X^2 = 16.8			P =.001	
C. Ability To Read Music						
No. Summer 156	21.8	12.8	30.1	20.5	14.7	2.93
No. Winter 21	4.8	19.0	19.0	42.9	14.3	3.42
		X^2 = 9.43			P = .05	
D. Instrumental Techniques						
No. Summer 149	20.1	14.8	34.9	22.1	8.1	2.83
No. Winter 21	0	14.3	28.6	33.3	23.8	3.67
		X^2 = 12.0			P = .01	

Table 3A --Cont'd

FACTOR		RATINGS					
		LITTLE OR NONE 1	2	3	4	A GREAT DEAL 5	MEAN RATING
E.Intonation							
No. Summer	121	17.3	10.7	37.2	27.3	7.4	2.97
No. Winter	17	0	11.8	29.4	35.3	23.5	3.71
			$X^2 = 9.59$			P = .05	
F.Rhythm							
No. Summer	158	18.4	10.1	35.4	25.9	10.1	2.99
No. Winter	21	0	9.5	28.6	38.1	23.8	3.76
			$X^2 = 9.25$			P = .05	
G.Tone Quality							
No. Summer	126	15.8	12.5	34.2	29.2	8.3	3.02
No. Winter	17	0	11.8	41.2	29.4	17.6	3.53
			$X^2 = 4.70$			P = .33	
H.Cooperation							
No. Summer	156	9.0	12.8	13.5	20.5	44.2	3.78
No. Winter	21	0	4.8	4.8	28.6	61.9	4.48
			$X^2 = 6.28$			P = .18	
I.Attendance							
No.Summer	158	12.7	10.7	11.3	17.7	47.5	3.76
No. Winter	21	19.0	19.0	9.5	23.8	28.6	3.24
			$X^2 = 4.85$			P = .30	
J.General Attitude							
No Summer	158	12.0	14.6	15.2	17.1	41.1	3.61
No. Winter	16	25.0	25.0	6.3	12.5	31.3	3.0
			$X^2 = 4.85$			P = .30	
K.Responsibility							
No. Summer	158	12.0	14.6	15.2	17.1	41.1	3.61
No. Winter	21	14.3	4.8	19.0	28.6	33.3	3.62
			$X^2 = 3.61$			P = .47	

Table 3A - Cont'd.

FACTOR		LITTLE OR NONE 1	2	3	4	A GREAT DEAL 5	MEAN RATING
L.Motivation							
No. Summer	*	----	----	----	----	----	----
No. Winter	21	9.5	9.5	14.3	33.3	33.3	3.40

Table 3B

Music Teacher's Ratings of Students at
End of Programs on the Amount of Improvement

Per Cent Distributions of Rating and Mean Ratings

FACTOR+		RATINGS LITTLE OR NONE 1	2	3	4	A GREAT DEAL 5	MEAN RATING
FACTOR							
A.General Musicianship							
No. Summer	156	12.2	16.7	23.7	25.6	21.8	3.28
No. Winter	21	9.5	9.5	33.3	38.1	9.5	3.28
			X^2 = 4.33			P = .38	
B.Group Performance							
No. Summer	143	14.7	12.6	22.4	25.2	25.2	3.14
No. Winter	14	14.3	14.3	35.7	14.3	21.4	3.14
			X^2 = 1.88			P = .76	
C.Ability To Read Music							
No. Summer	154	13.0	16.2	21.4	24.7	24.7	3.32
No. Winter	21	14.3	23.8	19.0	14.3	28.6	3.19
			X^2 = 1.88			P = .76	

* This factor had no antecedent data in the summer instrument.

Table 3B Cont'd

FACTOR+		RATINGS					
		LITTLE OR NONE 1	2	3	4	A GREAT DEAL 5	MEAN RATING
D.Instrumental Techniques							
No. Summer	148	12.2	15.5	20.3	29.1	23.0	3.36
No. Winter	21	9.5	9.5	33.3	19.0		3.48
			$X^2 = 3.41$			P = .49	
E.Intonation							
No. Summer	120	10.0	10.8	30.0	25.8	23.3	3.41
No. Winter	17	11.8	17.6	35.3	5.9	29.4	3.24
			$X^2 = 5.25$			P = .27	
F.Rhythm							
No. Summer	156	11.5	17.3	26.3	25.0	19.9	3.25
No. Winter	21	9.5	28.6	28.6	9.5	23.8	3.10
			$X^2 = 2.31$			P = .68	
G.Tone Quality							
No. Summer	118	10.2	13.6	20.3	28.8	27.1	3.49
No. Winter	17	11.8	0	35.3	35.3	17.6	3.47
			$X^2 = 5.05$			P = .28	
H.Cooperation							
No. Summer	154	24.0	11.7	18.8	11.7	33.7	3.19
No. Winter	21	33.3	9.5	23.8	14.3	19.0	2.76
			$X^2 = 1.93$			P = .74	
I.Attendance							
No. Summer	154	33.1	12.3	13.0	7.1	34.4	2.97
No. Winter	21	52.3	14.3	14.3	4.8	14.3	2.15
			$X^2 = 5.05$			P = .28	
J.General Attitude							
No. Summer	151	21.8	16.6	15.9	12.6	33.1	3.19
No. Winter	16	43.7	18.8	12.5	6.3	18.8	2.38
			$X^2 = 5.18$			P = .27	

Table 3B Cont'd.

FACTOR+	RATINGS					
	LITTLE OR NONE 1	2	3	4	A GREAT DEAL 5	MEAN RATING
K.Responsibility						
No. Summer 153	25.5	16.4	15.0	11.1	32.0	3.08
No. Winter 21	33.3	14.3	19.0	19.0	14.3	3.09
		$X^2 = 4.02$			P = .42	
L.Motivation						
No. Summer *	----	----	----	----	----	----
No. Winter 21	23.8	19.0	23.8	14.3	19.0	2.84

IV Reactions of the Students

Students' questionnaires were distributed to all the students of the Winter Program. Fifteen of the 26 students remaining in the program replied. Analysis of the sample group of responding students show the following characteristics. All of the students originated from the New York City area. The largest group, six of the fifteen, identified Brooklyn as their school's location. Manhattan was next, followed by Bronx and Queens. Richmond was not represented. Nine of the fifteen students were at the intermediate or junior high level. Six of the fifteen were at the high school level. One of the students attended a parochial high school. Ten or two-thirds of the respondents were girls, five or one-third were boys. The students average age was 14.5 years. Distribution of grade placement showed seven were at

* This Factor had no antecedent data in summer instrument

the ninth grade and one was in grade 10. All except one attended last year's summer program.

With the exception of two respondents all preferred learning in a group. All of these except one, expressed a preference for learning with a few others; The exception indicated a preference for "many companions". Summaries of students self-ratings in applicable areas are shown in Table 4 Ratings are based upon frequency percentage distributions based upon a five point rating scale as indicated in the table. One of the student's added the item of "very much improvement in mathematics."

Table 4

Summary of 15 Students Self-Ratings in Various Areas
Winter 1969 Program Percentages

AREA	1. NONE OR VERY LITTLE	2 A LITTIE	3 SOME	4 MUCH	5 VERY MUCH
Dance	20.0	13.3	33.3	20.0	13.3
Art	13.3	20.0	33.3	13.3	20.0
Instrumental Music	----	6.7	20.0	20.0	53.3
Singing	46.7	13.3	6.7	26.7	6.7
Theater	53.3	13.3	20.0	6.7	6.7
Writing	6.7	20.0	33.3	13.3	26.7
Science	6.7	20.0	13.3	26.7	33.3
Typing	40.0	6.7	20.0	20.0	13.3

Attitude tests relating to certain school oriented items were included in a fixed choice; agree, disagree, neither, group of items are summarized in Table 5. It was of interest to note that 87% of the group disagreed with a statement that "most homework is a waste of time and not helpful at all." They were unanimous in the feeling that "going to school would help in their life's work." Eighty per cent disagreed with the statement "I would probably learn more from a month on the job than from a year in school." Eighty per cent also affirmed that "having an education is the only way a person can get ahead in the world today." Ninety-three per cent disagreed with the statement "I would like to drop out of school soon."

Table 5

Summary of 15 Students' Reactions to Certain School-Related Attitudes

Percentage Frequencies

STATEMENT	1 DISAGREE	2 AGREE	3 NEITHER
Most of the homework I get is a waste of time and not helpful at all	86.7	6.7	6.7
Going to school will help me in my life's work	----	100.0	----
I could probably learn more from a month on the job than from a year in school	80.0	6.7	13.3
Having a good education is the only way a person can get ahead in the world today	6.7	80.0	13.3
I would like to drop out of school soon	93.3	6.7	----

Table 6 that follows, is a summary of a group of fixed-choice reactions to certain relationships within the framework of school, social economic and political contexts. A high plurality, or majority of respondents indicated "happy feelings" as an attitudinal response to all item categories except the item entitled "The fight for equality". About half reported no feelings for this item although the membership in the group may be characterized as being composed of members of minority groups. Second in frequency of response to this item was tabulated in the category "happy".

Table 6

Summary of 15 Students' Attitudes to Various Concepts
Percentage Frequencies

N = 15	1 HAPPY	2 UNHAPPY	3 NO FEELING
Learning something new	93.3	----	6.7
Going home from school each day	46.7	13.3	40.0
My neighborhood	46.7	26.7	26.7
The kind of person I am	66.7	6.7	26.7
How well I read	46.7	40.0	13.3
The fight for equality	33.3	20.0	46.7
The job I will have some day	80.0	6.7	13.3
The school I attend	53.3	26.7	20.0
The types of friends I have	73.3	6.7	20.0
The quality of education I get	66.7	13.3	20.0
How much I know	60.0	20.0	20.0

Two items related to future careers. The first, a four option choice describing present feelings toward life's work show a majority, 66.7% selected "I have a clear idea, but have made no decisions". Responses to "Are you planning to go to college?" showed a preponderance favorable, 86%, of whom 53% indicated "Iprobably will go, but I am not sure." No respondent answered "I don't intend to go". Students were requested to rate questionnaire items 30 to 39 on a three point scale "no interest", "some interest", of various cultural and scholastic activities. These ratings are summarized in Table 7.

Table 7

Summary of Additional Attitudes in 15 Student Responses
Percentage Frequencies by Item

ITEMS 30 - 39	1 NO INTEREST	2 SOME INTEREST	3 GREAT INTEREST
Listening to music	----	13.3	86.7
Drawing pictures	6.7	40.0	53.3
Playing a musical instrument	----	6.7	93.3
Singing	6.7	33.3	60.0
Visiting museums or art galleries	6.7	60.0	33.3
Learning about my background	----	33.3	66.7
Going to concerts	6.7	33.3	60.0
Going to dances	6.7	40.0	53.3
Learning about science	20.0	26.7	46.7
Writing stories or articles	6.7	40.0	53.3

Ten or two-thirds of the respondents answered an open-ended request for comments or suggestions. Comments were all favorable. Many of the respondents indicated extreme satisfaction with the previous summers' program and expressed desires to return. One included a suggestion for more formal discipline in classes to accelerate learning. These comments are summarized in Table 8 with the indicated frequency of occurrence of the comments.

Table 8

Summary and Frequency of Mention of 15 Student Comments and Suggestions

Comment or Suggestion	Frequency
1. Enjoyed and approved the current PEP project as is	6
2. Desires to return to this project	6
3. Would like to return to summer project	3
4. Summer program was helpful	2
5. Expressed amplification of item choices	2
6. Enabled a continuation of musical education	2
7. Hopes that it start earlier next year	2
8. Teachers work well with us	1
9. Suggest more formality in class	1
10. Met friends made at PEP	1

V. Summary and Conclusions

The Winter Program to Excite Potential (P.E.P.) was designed as a second follow-through of the more extensive summer P.E.P. program that had been held in the previous summer. The winter program, started in December 1968, was limited both as to scope and size. The number of student participants in the winter program approximated 20% of the summer group. Although student participants in the program were an ethnically mixed group, most were members of minority groups.

The program was adequately housed at the Riverdale School of Music in the Bronx, New York. Transportation between the school and the city transit lines was provided. The program was staffed by a director, a non-paid consultant and ten teachers of music. The program was designed to provide a continuation of musical instruction, experiences, enrichment and motivation for 45 of the participants of the previous summer's P.E.P. program who were attending schools in the New York City area.

The principal evaluative objectives were (a) to determine to what extent the program functioned according to original specifications of the proposal; (b) to determine to what degree the program affected students' achievements and behavior; and (c) to determine the effectiveness of the supporting services, facilities and materials.

Procedures

Questionnaires and rating scales were administered to the Project Director, teachers and participating students. Personal interviews and observations in addition to school records were used to gather data for this survey by the investigator. The entire student group was used. Statistical summaries, analyses and comparisons were made of mean ratings,

on the rating scales. In addition, chi square comparisons were made between frequency distribution of teachers' ratings of students obtained at the end of the summer program, August 1968, and those obtained at the end of winter program, ending in June, 1969. The end-of-summer ratings served as pretest data and the end of the winter program's ratings served as post-test data. Comparisons were made of the distribution of ratings of the entire summer 1968 group with the winter 1969 group which was an integral part of the former. A more direct comparison on an individual matched basis would have been preferable but was not implemented due to difficulty of access to prior rating data.

Major Findings and Conclusions

Pupil participation was at a relatively high level. Of the 32 students who started the program, 26 continued to its conclusion with an attendance average of 81%. The ten teachers were assigned an average of seven students each. The director and teacher self-evaluations indicated that the program had accomplished its objectives to a very high degree. A summary of the teachers' ratings of the students indicated that many showed substantial improvements in the areas of musical abilities and attitudinal traits.

Summaries of student self-ratings confirmed these indicated improvements in academic attitudes and aspirations in addition to the attainment of musical abilities and appreciations. A high percentage of students, 85%, indicated positive aspirations related to the continuance of their school careers to include attendance at college.

Mean ratings for 12 musical achievement and school related traits or factors were computed. Only 11 of these were compared because, the

twelfth, the motivational factor, had no antecedent in the previous summer program in 1968. Each factor or trait was rated along the dimensions, "Amount of Improvement" and "Level of Ability". Comparisons were made between the mean ratings obtained in the winter and summer programs. With respect to the "Amount of Improvement" eight of the eleven factors showed increases in the mean ratings for the winter program. For "Level of Ability" the direction was reversed; nine of the eleven factors or traits showed a decrease in means from the summer to the winter program.

Chi square tests were applied to frequency distributions to assist the interpretation of differences in the frequency distributions. These tests indicated, that with respect to "Level of Ability", differences in the distributions in the ratings of eight of the eleven compared may be attributed to factors other than chance. With respect to the "Amount of Improvement", four of the eleven differences may be attributed to factors other than chance. The observed significant differences in ratings relative to the "Level of Ability" and "Amount of Improvement" may be ascribed to differences in both the population being rated and the rating groups.

The program fulfilled its objectives as perceived by the director and the teachers to a high degree. Eight of the eleven student factors measured showed increases in the amounts of improvement. The attendance of the group remaining in the project was good and a high proportion of those starting the program, 26 of 32, finished it. Students self-ratings indicated a high percentage of positive feelings toward the program and toward school work.

Recommendations and Suggestions

It is recommended that the winter program start promptly at the beginning of the fall term so that a continuous follow through from the summer program be provided. An earlier start may also assist in arranging a fuller program of student participation and attendance at concerts and recitals.

The school facilities provided were more than adequate. Their spaciousness was such that they might be characterized as under utilized for the purposes of this program. From this viewpoint the program may be comfortably expanded to accommodate a larger population. Certain organizational benefits of a larger program may thus ensue, such as the inclusion of a guidance specialist in the staff to counsel those students who drop out of the program. In addition, the counselor could contribute supportive service in other areas.

The winter program may serve as a screening or orientation situation for prospective summer program student participants as well as a follow through of the previous program.

A more central physical plant location should be considered if the program is expanded to facilitate the transportation problem of those students who do not reside in center city or neighboring locations.

Data obtained from previous evaluations should be stored at a central location so that it be more readily available for longitudinal studies.

FM 22-792
4/69

APPENDIX A
BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
BUREAU OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

PEP (PROGRAM TO EXCITE POTENTIAL)
QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PROJECT DIRECTORS

Name_____Title_____

1. Number of days program will be in session in school year September 1968-June 1969 _____

2. Total number of students participating in the program _____

3. a) What is the total number of teachers on the instructional staff?_____
   b) Number of teachers of music? _____
   c) Number of teachers of dance? _____
   d) Other instructors (please specify)_____

4. Total number of classes formed _____

5. Please list the number and type of positions in addition to actual teaching positions _____

   a) Supervisory (please indicate number and type) _____

   b) Consultants _____
   c) Other (please list) _____

6. In terms of anticipated enrollment, facilities made available, supplies received, participation of personnel etc., to what extent (in per cent) would you say the program has been implemented? _____per cent

7. Relating the anticipated outcomes of the program to the actual outcomes, please rate the success of the program by circling the number above the appropriate description.

1	2	3	4	5
Very Unsuccessful	Unsuccessful	Partially Successful	Successful	Highly Successful

8. Please list in descending order of percentage of occurrence, the three most frequent reasons for students dropping out of the program.

1._____ %_____
2._____ %_____
3._____ %_____

9. Do you believe the program should operate again next school year?

Yes _____ No _____

Please explain briefly the reasons for your answer.

_____

_____

_____

10. If the program should operate next school year
a) What aspects of the program should be continued?

_____

_____

_____

_____

b) What aspects of the program should be discontinued?

_____

_____

_____

_____

c) What additional suggestions would you make for the program's improvement?

_____

_____

_____

_____

P.N. 22 - 792
4/69

APPENDIX B

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
BUREAU OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE
PROGRAM TO EXCITE POTENTIAL (PEP)

1. Name _____

2. Teaching Subject Area: _____

3. How many students in the PEP winter program 1968-69 have you instructed?

_____

4. Educational Background:
Please check highest Level of preparation:
_____ a) Doctorate degree
_____ b) Master's degree
_____ c) Bachelor degree
_____ d) Other please specify _____
_____
_____
_____

5a. Do you hold N.Y.C. Teacher's License? ____ If so which area_____
_____

6a Do you hold N.Y.S. Teacher's License? ____ If so which area_____
_____
_____

6c Other licenses held please specify _____
_____
_____
_____

7. Briefly describe the salient features of your program (in ab out 50-75 words.)_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

8. To what extent do you feel you have accomplished the goals of your program as set up? Please circle.

1	2	3	4	5
none or very little	a little	some	much	very much

9. Which goals in your program gave you unusual difficulty, if any? Please explain briefly.

_____

_____

_____

_____

10. How would you characterize the motivational impact of the program on most of the students? Please circle.

1	2	3	4	5
needed a great deal of reinforcement	needed some reinforcement	needed minor reinforcement	somewhat self motivated	strongly self motivated

PN 22-792
4/69

APPENDIX C

BUREAU OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH
PEP (Program to Excite Potential)

INDIVIDUAL STUDENT EVALUATION FORM
(Music Classes)

1. INSTRUCTOR _____

2. STUDENT NAME _____

3. WHAT INSTRUMENT DOES THE STUDENT PLAY? _____

4. STUDENT STARTED COURSE ON _____

5. TODAY'S DATE _____

INSTRUCTIONS: Please complete one form for each student currently in your PEP music class. Under PART A, rate the student's present abilities with reference to each factor listed. Circle one number between 1 and 5, with 1 representing the "poor" and 5 representing the "excellent" ends of the continuum.

In PART B, indicate the amount of improvement the student has made since he started the course. Circle one number between 1 and 5, with 1 representing "little improvement" and 5 representing "a great of improvement."

6. EVALUATION FACTOR	PART A PRESENT LEVEL OF ABILITY					PART B AMOUNT OF IMPROVEMENT				
	POOR				EXCEL-LENT	LITTLE OR NONE				A GRE DEAL
A. GENERAL MUSICIANSHIP	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
B. GROUP PERFORMANCE	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
C. ABILITY TO READ MUSIC	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
D. INSTRUMENTAL TECHNIQUE	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
E. INTONATION	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
F. RHYTHM	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
G. TONE QUALITY	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
H. CO-OPERATION	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
I. ATTENDANCE	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
J. GENERAL ATTENDANCE	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
K. RESPONSIBILITY	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5
L. MOTIVATION	1	2	3	4	5	1	2	3	4	5

22-792
69

APPENDIX D

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
BUREAU OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH
PROGRAM TO EXCITE POTENTIAL (PEP) 1968-1969

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

PRINT NAME _____ AGE ____ SEX ____
Last Name First Name

GRADE IN SEPT., 1968 _____ SCHOOL _____ CITY _____

1. Did you attend PEP last year?

1 ( ) Yes
2 ( ) No

2. When you are learning, would you rather be alone or have companions?

1 ( ) Alone
2 ( ) With a few others
3 ( ) With many others

(Items 3 to 11)

Since September 1968 how much improvement have you made in each of the following areas? Rate yourself by putting a check mark in one of the boxes in each row.

	1 NONE OR VERY LITTLE	2 A LITTLE	3 SOME	4 MUCH	5 VERY MUCH
3. Dance					
4. Art					
5. Instrumental music					
6. Singing					
7. Theater					
8. Writing					
9. Science					
10. Typing					
11. Other _____ (Specify) _____					

(Items 12 to 16)

Below are some statements that could be made about school. For each numbered statement, show how strongly you agree with it by checking in one of the boxes in each row.

	1 DISAGREE	2 AGREE	3 NEITHER
12. Most of the homework I get is a waste of time and not helpful at all			
13. Going to school will help me in my life's work			
14. I could probably learn more from a month on the job than from a year in school			
15. Having a good education is the only way a person can get ahead in the world today			
16. I would like to drop out of school soon			

(Items 17 to 27)

Below are listed several things about which you may have either HAPPY or UNHAPPY feelings. For each numbered item, put a check mark in one of the boxes in each row.

	1 HAPPY	2 UNHAPPY	3 NO FEELING
17. Learning something new			
18. Going home from school each day			
19. My neighborhood			
20. The kind of person I am			
21. How well I read			
22. The light set aqueliez			
23. The job I will have someday			
24. The school I attend			
25. The types of friends I have			
26. The quality of education I get			
27. How much I know			

28. Which one of the following best describes your current feelings about your life's work? (Place a check by your answer)

1( ) I have definitely decided
2( ) I have a clear idea, but have made no decisions
3( ) I have a vague idea, but have made no decisions
4( ) I am completely undecided

29. Are you planning to go to college?

1 ( ) I will definitely go
2 ( ) I will probably go, but I'm not sure
3 ( ) I might go, but I don't think it's likely
4 ( ) I don't intend to go
5 ( ) I don't know

(Items 30 to 39)

Below are some activities that may or may not be interesting to you. Show how much you are interested in each by marking your answer with a check in one of the boxes in each row.

	1 NO INTEREST	2 SOME INTEREST	3 GREAT INTEREST
30. Listening to music			
31. Drawing pictures			
32. Playing a musical instrument			
33. Singing			
34. Visiting museums or art galleries			
35. Learning about my background			
36. Going to concerts			
37. Going to dances			
38. Learning about science			
39. Writing stories or articles			

40. Please list any comments or suggestions. (You may use the other side of page if more space is needed).